



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,822	08/10/2001	Christian L. Kuiawa	18133-102	6244

30623 7590 12/16/2004

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY
AND POPEO, P.C.
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER
BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER

MUHEBBULLAH, SAJEDA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/927,822	Applicant(s) KUIAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner Sajeda Muhebbullah	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/24/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2-4, 10-12, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayo et al. ("Mayo", US 5,751,965) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("Applicant's admitted art").

As per claim 2, Mayo teaches in a system coupled to a plurality of devices, which are being monitored by the system, the system including a display, a method of monitoring diagnosed states of the devices comprising (col.5, lines 5-10):

displaying a monitoring icon with a normal indicia if each device being monitored by the system is diagnosed to be in a normal state (col.8, lines 23-47); and

displaying the monitoring icon with an abnormal indicia if at least one of the devices being monitored by the system is diagnosed to be in an abnormal state (col.8, lines 23-47).

Although Mayo teaches monitoring a computer system with a plurality of devices, Mayo does not teach the system coupled to a plurality of UPS devices. Applicant's admitted art teaches the use of UPS devices within computer systems to be widely used (Specification, page 2, lines 16-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to monitor UPS devices using Mayo's method in order to monitor whether the system is being provided power and operating sufficiently.

As per claim 3, the method of Mayo and Applicant's admitted art teaches the method further comprising:

diagnosing the abnormal state of the at least one UPS device as one of multiple levels of abnormal states;

associating each level of abnormal state with a different abnormal indicia; and

displaying the monitoring icon with the abnormal indicia associated with the diagnosed level of abnormal state of the UPS device (Mayo, col.8, lines 23-47).

As per claim 4, the method of Mayo and Applicant's admitted art teaches the method further comprising:

prioritizing the multiple levels of the abnormal states; and

displaying the monitoring icon with the abnormal indicia associated with a level of higher priority when one UPS device is at one level of priority and another UPS device is at a different level of priority (Mayo, col.8, lines 23-47).

Independent claims 10 and 17 are similar in scope to independent claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 11-12 are similar in scope to claims 3-4 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

3. Claims 5-7 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayo et al. ("Mayo", US 5,751,965) and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("Applicant's admitted art") as applied to claims 2-4, 10-12, and 17 above, and further in view of Chin et al. ("Chin", US 6,456,306).

As per claim 5, the method of Mayo and Applicant's admitted art teaches the method as recited in claim 4, further comprising:

opening a dialog window when the monitoring icon is selected (Mayo, col.2, lines 64-67; col.10 lines 47-52; Fig.12).

However, the method of Mayo and Applicant's admitted art does not teach displaying in the dialog window a list of UPS devices being monitored and corresponding states of at least a portion of the UPS devices on the list. Chin teaches a method of displaying the status of devices whereby a list of the devices are displayed with their corresponding state (Fig.6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Chin's teaching with the method of Mayo and Applicant's admitted art in order to view the overall state of all the devices simultaneously.

As per claim 6, the method of Mayo, Applicant's admitted art, and Chin teaches the method as recited in claim 5, further comprising:

receiving an input selecting a UPS device from the list (Chin, col.6, lines 55-58);

displaying a menu upon selection of a UPS device from the list, the menu comprising at least one UPS management function; receiving an input selecting a UPS management function from the menu; and causing the UPS management function to be performed on the selected UPS device (col.8, lines 55-67; *menu is only operable after selecting a device from the list*).

As per claim 7, the method of Mayo, Applicant's admitted art, and Chin teaches the method as recited in claim 6, further comprising:

opening a status window; and displaying in the status window at least one event associated with the state of a UPS device when the UPS device is selected from the list of UPS devices (Chin, col.6, lines 55-64).

Claim 13 is similar in scope to claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 14 is similar in scope to claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

4. Claims 8-9, 15-16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayo et al. ("Mayo", US 5,751,965), Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("Applicant's admitted art"), and Chin et al. ("Chin", US 6,456,306) as applied to claims 2-7, 10-14, and 17 above, and further in view of Moore et al. ("Moore", US 5,825,656).

As per claim 8, the method of Mayo, Applicant's admitted art, and Chin teach the method as recited in claim 7, further comprising:

displaying a selectable analysis icon (Chin, Fig.8, *section 870-ANALYZE icon*).

However, the method of Mayo, Applicant's admitted art, and Chin does not teach displaying a power event analysis of a UPS device selected from the list of UPS devices when a power event analysis icon is selected. Moore teaches a power monitoring system whereby the system displays power analysis of a device (Fig.8). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include Moore's teaching with the method of Mayo, Applicant's admitted art, and Chin in order to further analyze the device.

As per claim 9, the method of Mayo, Applicant's admitted art, Chin and Moore teach the method as recited in claim 8, further comprising:

displaying a selectable analysis icon (Chin, Fig.8, *section 870-ANALYZE icon*); and

displaying a voltage analysis of a UPS device selected from the list of UPS devices when the voltage analysis icon is selected (Moore, Fig.7).

Claims 15-16 are similar in scope to claims 8-9 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 18, the method of Mayo, Applicant's admitted art, Chin and Moore teach the system of claim 16 further comprising means for diagnosing the state of a UPS device operably coupled to the system (Mayo, col.7, lines 30-35).

5. Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roosen et al. ("Roosen", US 6,618,163) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("Applicant's admitted art").

As per independent claim 19, Roosen teaches in a management system comprising a processor and a display, the system in operable communication with a plurality of devices, a method for obtaining information about at least one of the plurality of devices, comprising:

displaying a dialog window having a selectable list comprising at least two of the plurality of devices (Fig.3);

displaying a menu upon selection of a device from the selectable list, the menu comprising at least one device property (Fig.4A-4C; col.6, lines 34-59);

receiving a selection input from the menu, the selection indicating the device property (Fig.4A-4C; col.6, lines 34-59); and

displaying information relating to the device property for the selected device (Fig.4A-4C; col.6, lines 34-59).

Although Roosen teaches monitoring a system with a plurality of devices, Roosen does not teach the system coupled to a plurality of UPS devices. Applicant's admitted art teaches the use of UPS devices within systems to be widely used (Specification, page 2, lines 16-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to monitor UPS devices using Roosen's method in order to monitor whether the system is being provided power and operating sufficiently.

As per independent claim 20, Roosen teaches in a management system comprising a processor and a display, the system in operable communication with a plurality of devices, a method for managing at least one of the plurality of devices, comprising:

displaying a dialog window having a selectable list comprising at least two of the plurality of devices (Fig.3);

displaying a menu upon selection of a device from the selectable list, the menu comprising a set of management functions relating to the device (col.6, lines 34-50);

receiving a selection input from the menu, the selection indicating a management function (col.6, line 50); and

causing the management function to be performed on the selected device (col.6, line 50).

Although Roosen teaches monitoring a system with a plurality of devices, Roosen does not teach the system coupled to a plurality of UPS devices. Applicant's admitted art teaches the use of UPS devices within systems to be widely used (Specification, page 2, lines 16-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to monitor UPS devices using Roosen's method in order to monitor whether the system is being provided power and operating sufficiently.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 21, the method of Roosen and Applicant's admitted art teaches the method of claim 20, wherein the step of displaying a set of management functions further comprises displaying at least one of the following management functions: locate UPS device, shutdown UPS device, delete UPS device, reapply configuration of UPS device (col.6, lines 47-67; *device configured as default*).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Battat et al. (US 5,958,012) teaches a management system using aggregated status indicators to indicate the overall status of the devices within.
- Li et al. (US 5,802,383) teaches a method of monitoring the status of networks using icons.
- Leong et al. (US 6,269,398) teaches a method of monitoring and managing the status of routers.

Art Unit: 2174

Communications

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sajeda Muhebbullah whose telephone number is (571) 272-4065. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday/Thursday from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm (EST) and on alternate Mondays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (571) 272-4063.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication]

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

(703) 746-9915 [For status inquiries, Draft Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Sajeda Muhebbullah
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2174

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100